DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 276 256 FL 016 208

AUTHOR Peyton, Joy Kreeft
TITLE Questions in ESL Classrooms: New Perspectives from Written Interaction.
INSTITUTION Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE [86]
NOTE 38p.; A revised version of a paper presented at the Annual Summer Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (7th, Washington, DC, July 12-13, 1985). For related documents, see FL 016 209 and FL 016 139-141.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Communication; *Dialogs (Language); Discourse Analysis; English (Second Language); Grade 6; Intermediate Grades; *Limited English Speaking; *Questioning Techniques; Second Language Instruction; *Teacher Student Relationship; Written Language
IDENTIFIERS Dialogue Journals

ABSTRACT

Questioning patterns in dialogue journal interactions of two groups of sixth graders are analyzed. One of the two groups was made up of native English speakers, while the other consisted of beginning learners of English as a second language. The analysis finds a pattern of shared interaction very different from that found in numerous studies of classroom discourse. In it, both participants, student and teacher, introduce topics and ask questions. Analysis of the form and type of teacher questions to individual students reveals considerable variation in both, related to the student's English proficiency level. This variation is similar to patterns found in native speaker-nonnative speaker interactions. Analysis of student questions and responses to teacher questions reveals increased student participation in the interaction over time. These findings suggest that dialogue journals offer a useful supplement to traditional classroom discourse, and perhaps a model that can be transferred to other interactions in the classroom context. A reference list, 2 figures, and 12 tables are appended. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED276256

Questions in ESL Classrooms: New Perspectives from Written Interaction

Joy Kreeft Peyton

Center for Applied Linguistics

Despite current emphasis on the importance of authentic interaction in second language acquisition, evidence from studies of ESL classrooms suggests that traditional interaction patterns still prevail. Such patterns differ considerably from native speaker-nonnative speaker (NS-NNS) interactions outside the classroom (Long and Sato, 1983). One difference is in question patterns. While questions in NS-NNS interaction serve to facilitate NNS participation, teacher questions in the ESL classroom tend to control conversational topic and test student knowledge.

This study analyzes questioning patterns in dialogue journal interactions of two groups of sixth graders--native English speakers and beginning ESL learners and their teacher and finds a pattern very different from that found in numerous studies of classroom discourse. The result is a shared interaction, with both participants introducing topics and asking questions.

Analysis of the form and type of teacher questions to individual students reveals considerable variation in both, related to the student's English proficiency level. This variation is similar to patterns found in NS-NNS interactions. Analysis of student questions and responses to teacher questions reveals increased student participation over time in the interaction.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joy Peyton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES

FL016208

These findings suggest that dialogue journals offer a promising supplement to age-old classroom discourse patterns and even a model that can be transferred to other interactions in the classroom context.

Despite the current emphasis in language acquisition theory on the importance of authentic interaction for promoting second language acquisition, evidence from the few studies done to date of ESL classroom discourse suggests that traditional patterns of student-teacher interaction still prevail. Such patterns differ considerably from interactions between native and nonnative English speakers outside the classroom (cf. Long and Sato, 1983, for a comparison of interaction patterns in the two settings). One difference lies in question-asking patterns. While questions in naturalistic, non-classroom conversations constitute one way in which the structure of interaction between native speakers (NS) and nonnative speakers (NNS) of a language is modified to facilitate NNS participation (Long, 1981a; 1981b), teacher questions in the ESL classroom tend instead to control conversational topic and drill and test student knowledge.

This study analyzes questioning patterns in one particular kind of classroom discourse, the written "dialogue journal" interactions of beginning ESL learners and their teacher. The analysis and discussion focus on three areas: questioning patterns in the journals as compared to those found in previous studies of questions in classrooms; variation in the teacher's questioning patterns to individual students; and changes over time in the students' question-and-response patterns. The study will show that questioning patterns in the dialogue journals differ

in several ways from those found to be typical in numerous studies of classroom discourse. The result is a shared interaction in the journals, one in which both participants introduce topics and ask questions. During the year the students' writing becomes increasingly interactive as teacher and student progressively respond to and ask more questions. The study suggests therefore that dialogue journals offer a promising supplement to classroom discourse, and may even provide a model that can be transferred to other interactions within the classroom context.

The data for the study are the daily writing, over nine months' time, of a sixth grade teacher in Los Angeles, California, and her students in "dialogue journals." A dialogue journal is a bound notebook in which this teacher and her students write regularly to each other. The students are told that they can write as much as they wish about whatever topics they choose, but they must write at least three sentences each day.[1] The teacher does not evaluate the students' writing, but

---

[1]The students are also told that their journals are private. Journal samples shown here were obtained with the students' permission.

---

participates instead as an active member of a written "conversation" that continues throughout the school term. Figure 1 shows a facsimile page from the dialogue journal of one of the students in the study.

The data come from the dialogue journal writing of two groups of students. One group consists of ten native English speakers, who were in this teacher's classroom during the 1979-80 school year (cf. Staton, et al., in press, for analysis of these students' dialogue journals). At

the end of the year, the teacher transferred to another school in Los Angeles, in which nearly all of the students were nonnative English speakers. Six students from the 1981-82 class were chosen for study. They had been in the United States for less than one year when they began writing in the journals. Figure 2 shows background information for these students. Based on school records and her own perceptions of the students' English language proficiency, the teacher classified them as:

High	U Chal
Mid	Michael
	Andy
Low	Laura
	Su Kyong
	Kemmy

A "question" in this study is determined by function rather than form. That is, a question is considered a request for a verbal (in this case written) reply. The request can take the form of an interrogative ("When is P.E.?"), an imperative ("Please tell me when P.E. is."), or a statement ("I don't know when P.E. is."). Therefore, some interrogatives that occur in these data are not included in the analysis, because they request an action rather than a verbal reply ("Will you please bring my book tomorrow?") and some non-interrogatives are included in the analysis.

Questions in Classroom Discourse and Dialogue Journal Writing

Studies of classroom interaction (the majority of which involve native English-speaking students) have consistently found three dominant features of question asking. We will look at each feature in turn and compare it to patterns in the dialogue journals. First, in the classroom,

the teacher asks all or the majority of the questions (Politzer, 1980; Shuy, 1981; Heath, 1982; Dillon, 1982). Politzer, for example, found that from 94 to 97 percent of the "requests" (which included both requests for information and requests for action in that study) made in the classroom were made by the teacher.

Table 1 shows the number of questions asked by the teacher and students in the two sets of dialogue journals--first, the journals of the NS during two ten-day sample periods, one in the fall and one in the spring;[2] and second, from the journals of the six NNS, during two twenty-

[2]This table includes data from all twenty-six students in the class of native English speakers; all others include only ten of the students, as explained above.

day samples, in the fall and spring. Although the teacher asks the majority of questions in both cases, the ratio of teacher questions to student questions is quite different from that found in classroom discourse. The students ask a substantial percentage of the questions in the journals, so that with both the NS and NNS, question asking is a shared activity. This is especially true in the spring with the NNS, where almost half of the questions are asked by the students.

Second, teacher questions in the classroom usually serve to initiate a three-part question-answer-feedback exchange (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975; Mishler, 1975; McHoul, 1978; Mehan, 1979; Long and Sato, 1983; Stubbs, 1983) such as:

Teacher:	What's the capital of France?	Initiation
Student:	Paris.	Reply
Teacher:	Right.	Feedback

Teacher:	And Germany?	Initiation
Student:	Bonn.	Reply
Teacher:	Good.	Feedback

(Example from Stubbs, 1983:29)

Since in face-to-face conversation a question constitutes the first half of an "adjacency pair" (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, 1974), a question both introduces a topic and compels a response. With initiating questions, the teacher establishes the topic, incurs upon the student the obligation to respond, and when the student has responded, has the right to speak again--with another question or an evaluation of the student's reply before asking another question.

I classified the teacher's questions in the dialogue journals as either "topic initiating" or "topic responding," as in these examples from the journals:

Topic initiating question

Teacher: What book are you reading?

Student: I'm reading of the book call "A Dog and a half." I think it is a good store. The store is the one boy and one girls and one day the girls want a dog and they tell her father I want a dog and they go to store and they want dog.

Topic responding question

Student: at the lunch time I help the Safety ... the thirt grate play the lunch finish so no drink water so I help the Safety, and I tell him go to the other water sink.

Teacher: Did the safety want you to help him?

(Emphasis in both examples mine.)

Table 2 shows the pattern with both classes. The majority of the teacher's questions, rather than initiating a topic, occur in response to a topic the student has initiated, and the percentage of responding questions increases somewhat as the year progresses.

With the NNS I also looked at the place of the student questions in the interaction (Table 3). Here we see a complementary pattern. The majority of the student questions serve to initiate topics rather than respond to teacher topics. Therefore, although in the journals the teacher asks more questions than the students do, it is the students' questions which determine what topics are written about.

The third area of difference lies in the kinds of questions the teacher asks in the journals. The majority of questions asked by teachers in classroom interaction, referred to as "evaluative questions" (Kearsley, 1976), "training questions" (Goody, 1978) or "display questions" (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975; Mehan, 1979; Shuy, 1981; Long and Sato, 1983) in classroom studies, serve to test whether the student possesses the information requested (as in, "What's the capital of France?") or, in a language classroom, to check whether the student has the language ability to answer the question (as in, "What's your name?").

I classified the teacher's questions in the dialogue journals as follows:

1. Request for information about school-related or personal activities and concerns--"When will you take the math test?"; "Where does your aunt live?". In this category I also included Requests for clarification, such as "I'm not sure your idea is clear. Could you explain it?" These occurred infrequently.

2. Request for opinion about school-related or personal activities and concerns--"The bicycle safety program was so good. Do you think they are smart to wear special clothes?"; "It sounds like you had fun eating pizza. Was it as good as the school pizza?"

3. Display question--"As the grass leaves grow up what happens when you turn the glass? Do the seeds send the leaves up or out the side?" (They have been discussing a science project in the journal.)

4. Reflective question--This type of question is the most difficult to classify. It is not a request for information, opinion, or clarification, and a written answer does not appear to be required. Rather the request is more that the student think about the question proposed. Examples of questions categorized as Reflective are:

to a NNS: "We do not fight at Alexandria. If you fight you can be suspended from school. What can you do so you will not fight?

to a NS: "Does it make you feel any better to know that you are learning to cope with this type of person?"

The frequency of occurrence of these four question types in the journals of the NS and NNS is shown in Table 4, listed more or less from most to least frequent. In the study of NS, imperatives in interrogative form (labelled Directive-type questions) were also counted, but these are not included in this study, so they are placed in parentheses in Table 4. We will look in more detail later at the comparative frequencies of question types to NS and NNS, but for now the table shows that in both sets of journals the frequency of Display questions is very low relative to other types, with Information and Opinion questions ranking the

highest in both cases.

From these findings related to the number of student and teacher questions, the place of student and teacher questions in the interaction, and the type of teacher questions, it is clear that with both NS and NNS this teacher's question patterns in the dialogue journals are very different from those found to be typical of classroom interaction. Mishler (1978) summarizes the pattern of classroom discourse in this way:

> The picture that emerges ... is of a rather restricted and highly controlled adult-child exchange where the adult asks a constraining yes/no question, receives a one-word response, and then terminates the exchange by a direct acknowledgement of the child's answer.
> (Mishler, 1978, p. 287)

Long and Sato (1983), in a study of teacher questions in ESL classrooms, found that even there, where increasing emphasis is placed on the importance of communication, the majority of teacher questions were display questions focusing on form and accuracy, rather than on communication.

In contrast, in the dialogue journals, this teacher shares with the students the power to ask questions. Rather than use questions to determine which topics are discussed, her questions serve to continue topics that the students have initiated. Rather than test the students' knowledge and ability to express themselves with display questions, she tends to elicit genuine information and opinions. The result is a student-initiated, ongoing interaction, in which both can participate equally, eliciting and providing information, opinions, etc.

Compare the prototypical classroom interaction (illustrated on p. 5) and the following interaction in U Chal's dialogue journal, in mid-October.

U Chal: In 10 million year later the men do one other map?
What you like do in your house?
Do you go vacation in other country?

Teacher: Yes, men will keep making maps! They are making new maps all of the time.
In my home I like to cook, to grow plants, to read and to sew. What do you like to do?
Sometimes we vacation in Canada or Mexico or Hawaii. I want to go to Korea some day. Do you want to go back to Brazil sometime?

U Chal: In my house I like to watch T.V., read book, ride bike and go to swim pol.
Maybe one day I go to Brazil to visit my frindes.
Your Korean Grandson speak koreian?

Teacher: Do you have a swimming pool? I like to swim but I don't have a pool.
You have friends in Brazil who can come visit you? Where did you live in Brazil?
My Korean Grandson does not speak Korean anymore. We do not know the Korean language so he learned English. I hope he will go to Korean class to learn to speak Korean again. He is a very smart boy.

U Chal: No, I don't have a pool. Some days one friend of my father come and go to hes pool.

> My friends not come to visit one day, my friends born in Brazil and for him Brazil is best for him. I live in Brazil on the state of Sao Paulo, one for month in Rio de Janeiro.
>
> Do you have one friend in the farm and he or she live in Los Angeles?

Questions are clearly an important part of this teacher's writing, but they seem especially designed to promote interaction and student participation. In the journals of the NNS, they resemble more closely the patterns described for informal NS-NNS interaction than for typical classroom discourse.

Modifications in Teacher Questions

Second language acquisition researchers studying interaction patterns in NS-NNS in informal, non-classroom conversations have noted that as the NS determines the level of proficiency of the NNS, he or she modifies questions accordingly to sustain the interaction over time, facilitate the participation of the NNS, and provide comprehensible input. For example, by using yes-no questions, in which "Yes" or "No" suffice as a response and or-choice questions such as, "Are you studying, or working here in the United States?," the NNS need only supply one of the two choices given in the question.

We now turn to modifications in the type and form of this teacher's questions to the two groups of students. First, we will consider modifications in type. The types of questions listed in Table 4 can be arranged along a continuum from more to less difficult--Reflective,

Opinion, Information, Display--according to the degree of original thought required to give a response. While Information and Display questions require simply a statement of facts, Opinion and Reflective questions require some thought, as well as requiring the responder to take a personal position. Table 5 compares the frequency of Information and Display questions and Opinion and Reflective questions combined with the two groups of students. With the NS, Opinion and Reflective questions combined are the most frequent, while Information and Display questions are the most frequent with the NNS, a statistically significant difference in the spring.

Another kind of variation is in the focus of the question--either on school-related ("Academic") activities or on "Personal" activities. With the NS there is a shift during the year from questions about school activities to questions about personal activities. With the NNS the focus remains on school activities throughout the year. This comparison is shown for Information and Opinion questions combined in Table 6. Again, the difference is statistically significant in the spring.

Whether the teacher asks a question relating to an academic topic or a personal topic depends to a great extent on what the student writes about, since as we saw earlier the majority of teacher questions are responses to student topics. But what we see here is a greater focus with the NNS on factual information related to the school context that the students and teacher share, the same sort of focus on the "here and now" that has been found both in numerous studies of interactions with first language learners and in studies of interaction with NNS.

Another area to be examined is question form. Questions can be classified as follows: statement, which has the form of a declarative,

but elicits information or an opinion; wh; yes-no; tag; and or-choice. Most scholars agree that these question forms range along a continuum, depending on the amount of information provided in the question and therefore the amount of "work" demanded in the response. Shuy (1981), for example, arranges them thus:

Most demand placed on the receiver

statement	Tell me about the party.
wh	How was the party?
yes-no	Did you like the party?
tag	It was a good party, wasn't it?
or-choice	Which did you like better, the party or the movie?

Least demand placed on the receiver

Table 7 shows the frequencies of each question type with the two groups of students. There is a clear preference with both groups for yes-no questions, with wh being the second most frequent and tag the third most frequent form. The other two forms are used infrequently. There is little variation in this pattern throughout the school year. There is a difference, however, in the relative frequency of yes-no and wh questions with the two groups of students. These are compared in Table 8. In the fall the percentage of yes-no questions asked of the NS is only slightly lower than of the NNS. In the spring yes-no questions to the NS decrease and wh questions increase, while with the NNS yes-no questions remain constant and wh questions decrease somewhat. Thus, by the spring, when the teacher has had several months to assess the students' language ability, there is a dramatic difference in the forms of the questions used with the two groups of students (significant at the .005 level--see Table 8).

So far this study has concentrated entirely on the teacher's questions. We have seen that her goal is to maintain an ongoing "conversation" in which she and the students participate equally. She accomplishes this goal by sharing question asking with the students, asking questions about topics that they introduce, asking genuine Information, Opinion, and Reflective questions, and modifying the form and type of question to suit what she assesses to be the language ability of the student.

Teacher Questions and Student Writing

We now shift our attention to the relationship between the teacher's questions and the students' interaction patterns. As stated earlier, the primary function of questions in any but very controlled contexts like the courtroom and many classrooms is to promote interaction. So the question arises, Does the students' writing become more interactive over time? To answer this question we will look at three aspects of the NNS' writing during the year: their response rate to the teacher's questions, the number of questions they ask her, and their desire and ability to continue to write about one topic over several entries.

The first issue is response rate. One feature of the dialogue journal interactions' written form is that a question does not have the same force to compel a reply as it does in speech. Often several topics are written about and several questions asked in one journal entry. It is possible therefore to be selective in responses, and some comments and questions are not responded to at all. Even the teacher does not respond to all of the students' questions (in this study her response rate ranges from around 60 to 90 percent). At the same time, a student

response to a question is desirable, because it indicates that the student has read and understands what was written and, in formulating a response, gets more language practice.

Table 9 shows the response rates of individual students to the teacher's questions in the fall and winter samples. There is a clear difference related to English language proficiency. U Chal, the most proficient student, consistently responds to almost all questions and Su Kyong and Kemmy, the least proficient students, respond to relatively few. Michael, Laura, and Andy fall in the middle. In each case, however, except for U Chal, who maintains a consistently high response rate all year, the response rate increases significantly over the ten months (Table 10), a sign that the students are learning to respond to questions and thus are becoming more interactive.

Another sign that students are participating in the interaction is their use of questions. Table 11 shows the number of questions asked by each student in the fall and spring samples. For each student, the increase in response rate to questions is accompanied by an increase in the number of questions that the student asks, indicating an increased desire and ability to interact as the year progresses. The only exception to this general pattern is again U Chal. While his response rate remains high, there is a sharp decrease in the spring in the number of questions that he asks. However, in his case this decrease does not indicate a decreased desire to communicate. On the contrary, he begins the year asking more questions than any other student. By the end of the year he and the teacher have established such a rapport in their journal that they sustain conversations about topics over a number of

entries, without depending on question-answer exchanges for motivation, as this example from his journal illustrates.

Teacher: How does your face feel? That ball bounced off of your hand right into your face. I hope your face isn't bruised.

U Chal: It didn't hurt much I had bad bumps in my head before ... Today was Jung An turn to get the ball on his face.

Teacher: Good! I was glad to see you this morning and see that you did not have a black eye or a swollen nose! I'll check Jung An in the morning to see if he has a black eye! We are learning to catch balls in an unusual way!

U Chal: I think that the ball didn't hurt to much to Jung An because it was a rubber ball.

Teacher: Rubber balls aren't as hard. Usually rubber balls aren't thrown as hard as softballs either.

A third measure of degree of student participation in the interaction is the extent to which topics are maintained over time. When most topics are simply introduced, responded to, and dropped, as in this example from Su Kyong's journal, not much interaction has occurred.

Su Kyong: today lunch time I'm dancing so fun lola to and Janny to going.

Teacher: Yes! It is fun to dance at noon! Were there any others from our class there?

Su Kyong: [no response]

This pattern contrasts noticeably with the extended topic in U Chal's journal.

Table 12 shows, of the total number of topics introduced by the students, the percentage that are then continued by the students for at least one more turn. Although the difference is not statistically significant, the percentages indicate a tendency by all of the students except Laura to interact over time about a greater number of topics as the year progresses. This means that rather than introducing and dropping topics after one entry, there is a greater exchange of information about a given topic at the end of the year than at the beginning.

Note that asking questions is not the only or even the most frequent conversational strategy used by this teacher in the journals, although the focus on questions in this paper may have created that impression. Studies by Shuy (1984) and Morroy (1985) of the same data show that questions make up only a small part of her writing (for example, in Shuy's study of language functions, only 20 percent of the teacher's language functions are questions). She is also involved in reporting facts and opinions, thanking, evaluating, predicting, apologizing, and giving directives. We need to remember also that the students ask questions as well. It is important to point this out, lest we imagine that dialogue journal writing consists of a student's writing about a topic and asking no questions and a teacher's asking questions about it and providing no information of his or her own. Such a pattern would quickly turn into another opportunity to quiz the student, similar to traditional classroom teaching, rather than a genuine exchange of ideas.

The findings of this study suggest a number of implications for

classroom practice. The first implication that can be drawn is that dialogue journal writing provides the opportunity to depart from the interaction patterns that appear to prevail even in the language classroom. The questioning patterns found here more closely resemble those found in native speaker-nonnative speaker interactions outside of the classroom, in which the purpose of the native speaker's questions is to open the door for increased participation by the nonnative speaker. As it appears that language acquisition occurs best in the context of genuine communication rather than the drilling of forms and testing of knowledge, it is essential that opportunities for such communication exist in the language classroom, rather than the traditional Initiation-Reply-Feedback pattern that still seems to dominate much classroom interaction. Once a teacher becomes accustomed to the kind of questioning patterns that grow naturally out of the one-to-one dialogue journal interaction, it might be possible to find ways to transfer them to other classroom activities as well.

Second, there is ample evidence that this teacher's questions are adjusted to the language level of the student and change in nature as the student becomes more fluent. This adjustment to individual levels of language proficiency is very difficult, if not impossible, in a classroom in which one teacher speaks at one time to a group of students who may vary greatly in language ability. It may be that more avenues need to be explored for allowing more individualized teacher-student interaction.

Third, it appears that the teacher's questions lead the students into more interaction by "teaching" them, through her responses to their

questions and through her questions, to respond to questions and to ask them, similar to a pattern that Goody (1978) found in mother-child interaction; mothers trained their children to ask questions by asking questions themselves.

The students' increasing participation in the dialogue journal interaction, which takes place in part through the asking and answering of questions, allows them to gradually take steps toward becoming fluent communicators. At the very beginning stages of the journal interaction, they may have difficulty responding to her questions at all. Eventually they begin to respond to her questions and thus add more detail to their writing, until eventually, as we saw in U Chal's journal, they may begin to express themselves freely without the need for questions. Dialogue journal interaction like that discussed here would appear, then, to be a highly functional classroom practice, with special promise for NNS students.

REFERENCES

Dillon, J. T. 1982. The multidisciplinary study of questioning. Journal of Educational Psychology. 74(2):147-165.

Goody, Esther N. 1978. Towards a theory of questions. In Esther N. Goody, ed. Questions and politeness: strategies in social interaction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 17-43.

Heath, Shirley B. 1982. Questions at home and at school: a comparative study. In G. Spindler (Ed.). Doing the ethnography of schooling: educational anthropology in action. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Kearsley, Greg P. 1976. Questions and question-asking in verbal discourse: a cross-disciplinary review. Journal of Psycholinguistic Research. 5(4):355-375.

Long, Michael H. 1981a. Input, interaction, and second language acquisition. Native language and foreign language acquisition. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences.

Long, Michael H. 1981b. Questions in foreigner talk discourse. Language Learning. 31(1):135-157.

Long, Michael H. and Charlene J. Sato. 1983. Classroom foreigner talk discourse: forms and functions of teachers' questions. In Herbert W. Seliger and M. H. Long (Eds.). Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House. 268-285.

McHoul, Alexander. 1978. The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. Language in Society. 7. 183-213.

Mehan, Hugh. 1979. Learning lessons. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Mishler, Elliot. 1975. Studies in dialogue and discourse: II. Types of discourse initiated by and sustained through questioning. Journal of Psycholinguistic Research. 4(2):99-121.

Mishler, Elliot. 1978. Studies in dialogue and discourse: III. Utterance structure and utterance function in interrogative sequences. Journal of Psycholinguistic Research. 7(4):279-305.

Morroy, Robby. 1985. Teacher strategies: linguistic devices for sustaining interaction in dialogue journal writing. Ph.D. Dissertation, Georgetown University.

Peyton, Joy Kreeft. In press. Why ask? The function of questions in dialogue writing. In Staton, Jana, Roger W. Shuy, Joy Kreeft Peyton and Leslee Reed. In press. Dialogue journal communication: classroom, linguistic, social, and cognitive views. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Politzer, Robert L. 1980. Requesting in elementary school classrooms. TESOL Quarterly. 14(2):165-174.

Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson. 1974. A simplest systematic for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. Language. 50(4):696-735.

Shuy, Roger W. 1981. A sociolinguistic analysis of talk in six language arts classrooms. In G. Morine-Dershimer, A. Ramirez, R. Shuy, and G. Gulluzzo. Final Report to the National Institute of Education. Participant perspectives of Classroom Discourse. California State University, Hayward.

Shuy, Roger W. 1984. The function of language functions in the dialogue journal interactions of nonnative English speakers and their teacher. In Joy Kreeft, Roger W. Shuy, Jana Staton, Leslee Reed, and Robby Morroy. Analysis of student-teacher interactive writing in the learning of English as a second language. Final Report to the National Institute of Education. NIE-G-83-0030. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Sinclair, J. McH. and Malcolm Coulthard. 1975. Towards an analysis of discourse. The English used by teachers and pupils. London: Oxford University Press.

Staton, Jana, Roger W. Shuy, Joy Kreeft Peyton and Leslee Reed. In press. Dialogue journal communication: classroom, linguistic, social, and cognitive views. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Stubbs, Michael. 1983. Discourse analysis: the sociolinguistic analysis of natural language. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tues., Feb. 3

Yes, you may do more than one report. Do you like making reports? What is your report going to be on?

You were right! A turtle is a reptile! Thank you for telling me!

The test is called CTBS test. It will help me to know what you need to learn before you go to junior high.

Feb. 4

Yes. I like to make reports if fun to make and at the same time we learn about life in the ocean.

I am doing the report about White Sharks then when I finish I am going to do about Dolphins if I have time.

In Brazil they only use Celcius they have Fahrenheit but they use Celcius to see the temperature to cook and the doctors use only Celcius to see the body temperature.

Feb. 4

You know Celcius better than Fahrenheit temperatures then, don't you? We are going to be doing some thermometer reading here in the room. We'll use both scales.

Dolphins or porpoises are unique mammals. They seem to have a language.

Feb. 7

I never read about Fahrenheit until I came to U.S. the first time I came I saw a filter of water

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dialogue Journal Facsimile

FIGURE 2

Nonnative English Speakers

Student	Country of Birth	First/Home Language	Length of Time in U.S. Schools at Beginning of Journal School Year
Michael	Burma	Burmese	8 months
Laura	Italy	Italian	5 months
Su Kyong	Korea	Korean	0 months
U Chal	Korea	Korean	6 months
Andy	Korea	Korean	3 months
Kemmy	Hong Kong	Cantonese	3 months

TABLE 1

Number of Student and Teacher Questions

Native and Nonnative English Speakers

Native English Speakers (Kreeft Peyton, in press)				
N=26 Students	Fall (10 days)		Spring (10 days)	
Student questions	136/353	39%	109/440	25%
Teacher questions	217/353	61%	331/440	75%
Nonnative English Speakers				
N=6 Students	Fall (20 days)		Spring (20 days)	
Student questions	42/127	33%	97/215	45%
Teacher questions	85/127	67%	118/215	55%

TABLE 2

Teacher Initiating and Responding Questions

Native and Nonnative English Speakers

Native English Speakers (Kreeft Peyton, in press)				
N=10 Students	Fall (10 days)		Spring (10 days)	
Topic initiating questions	35/84	42%	38/124	31%
Topic responding questions	49/84	58%	86/124	69%
Nonnative English Speakers				
N=6 Students	Fall (20 days)		Spring (20 days)	
Topic initiating questions	31/85	36%	39/118	33%
Topic responding questions	54/85	64%	79/118	67%

TABLE 3

Student Initiating and Responding Questions

Nonnative English Speakers

N=6 Students	Fall (20 days)		Spring (20 days)	
Topic initiating questions	28/42	67%	77/97	79%
Topic responding questions	14/42	33%	20/97	21%

TABLE 4

Types of Teacher Questions

Native and Nonnative English Speakers

Native English Speakers				
N=10 students	Fall (10 days)		Spring (10 days)	
Opinion	44/84	52%	50/124	40%
Information	27/84	32%	49/124	40%
Reflective	1/84	1%	16/124	13%
Display	4/84	5%	0/124	0%
(Directive	8/84	10%	9/124	7%)
Nonnative English Speakers				
N=6 students	Fall (20 days)		Spring (20 days)	
Information	46/85	54%	72/118	61%
Opinion	34/85	40%	37/118	31%
Reflective	1/85	1%	6/118	5%
Display	4/85	5%	3/118	3%

TABLE 5

Teacher Question Type to Native and Nonnative English Speakers by Degree of Difficulty

	Fall		Spring			
	NS*	NNS	NS	NNS	X^2(df=1)	p
Opinion and Reflective	45/84	35/85	66/124	43/118	6.22	.025
Information and Display	31/84	50/85	49/124	75/118	13.04	.001

*For the NS these two categories do not account for all questions asked, because there was also a category for Directive-type questions (see Table 4).

TABLE 6

Teacher Information and Opinion Questions Focusing on Academic and Personal Topics with Native and Nonnative Speakers

	Fall		Spring			
	NS*	NNS	NS	NNS	X^2(df=1)	p
Academic	53/72	56/80	24/98	69/109	30.46	<.001
Personal	6/72	24/80	55/98	40/109	7.46	.01

*For the NS these two categories do not account for all questions asked, because there was also a category for "Interpersonal" questions.

TABLE 7

Teacher Question Forms with Native and Nonnative Speakers

Native English Speakers				
	Fall		Spring	
yes-no	57	68%	71	57%
wh	17	20%	35	28%
tag	4	5%	9	7%
or-choice	1	1%	8	6%
statement	5	6%	1	.8%
TOTAL	84		124	

Nonnative English Speakers				
	Fall		Spring	
yes-no	63	74%	90	76%
wh	16	19%	15	13%
tag	5	6%	11	9%
or-choice	1	1%	2	2%
statement	0	0%	0	0%
TOTAL	85		118	

TABLE 8

Teacher yes-no and wh Questions with Native and Nonnative Speakers

	Fall		Spring			
	NS	NNS	NS	NNS	X^2(df=1)	p
yes-no	57/84	63/85	71/124	90/118	8.98	.005
wh	17/84	16/85	35/124	15/118	7.96	.005

TABLE 9

Student Response Rate to Teacher Questions

	Fall		Spring	
U Chal	21/22	95%	21/23	91%
Michael	7/13	54%	11/14	81%
Andy	1/10	10%	5/10	50%
Laura	5/10	50%	17/29	59%
Su Kyong	1/21	5%	4/17	24%
Kemmy	1/9	11%	4/25	16%
TOTAL	36/85	42%	62/118	53%

TABLE 10

Change over Time in Student Response Rate

(Excluding U Chal)

Fall	Spring	X^2(df=1)	p
15/63	41/95	5.38	.025

TABLE 11

Number of Student Questions

	Fall	Spring
U Chal	27	4
Michael	13	43
Andy	1	7
Laura	0	26
Su Kyong	0	3
Kemmy	1	14
TOTAL	42	97

TABLE 12

Extended Topic Chains out of Total Topics Introduced by Students

	Fall		Spring	
U Chal	8/23	35%	7/13	54%
Michael	5/46	11%	11/64	17%
Andy	0/44	0%	5/39	13%
Laura	6/13	46%	10/53	19%
Su Kyong	1/26	4%	4/26	15%
Kenny	2/70	3%	4/85	5%
TOTAL	22/222	10%	41/280	15%

Biographical statement

Joy Kreeft Peyton is a Research Associate at the Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C. She has co-authored two research reports on using dialogue journals with Native English speakers and with non-native speakers. She has used dialogue journals with adult ESL students, and has conducted numerous teacher workshops on the topic.

Acknowledgments

This study is part of a larger project funded by the National Institute of Education, NIE-G-0030. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Seventh Annual TESOL Summer Meeting, July 12-13, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. Many people deserve thanks for help in the preparation of this manuscript. Madeline Adkins assisted in the coding of questions, and Ralph Fasold performed the statistical analysis. Donna Christian, Roger Shuy, and Jana Staton also made helpful comments on earlier drafts.